

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/697,110	ISHII, MAKOTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taghi T. Arani	2131	

**All Participants:**

(1) Taghi T. Arani.

(2) Dennis M. Smid, ESq.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 29 March 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4, 12-13, 16, and 24

Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Lack of antecedent basis in the claims 13, 16 and 24 reciting the term "examination means" raised and agreed to amend the claims for "receiver terminal". Applicant suggested minor corrections in claims 4, 12, and 24 to replace the term "have" with "having".